6/6/67

Dear Carl,

The signature at the beginning is to keep my from forgetting again. But my typing is so terrible it is a signature!

I knew Arthus had a foundation more than a year ago. I knew of the Price Foundation when the foundation-CIA story broke a long time ago. I know of no other Price Foundation than his. So maybe it is all one. If it is, it doesn't worry me. I worked with the genuine articles for some time.

To answer your ~~artixlexinxhnx~~ letter (I've very tired) in haste: I imagine I am responsible for the Shaw-Bertrand statement by the DJ. And it did get used by some newspapers. I have the Wash Post and the N.O. papers stories. I say all of this and much more in my N.O. bok, that for the first time is now going around among the publishing houses. I can trace Hoover's statement of 11/24/66 to a similar thing. He then answer charges from my unpublished work, charges I had never made publicly. It is quite true there was no Shaw investigation. "one was needed. I point out there could have been none without his knowledge. This just makes a bigger mess for them. They improvise their lies, which is not very wise. Maybe there will be a few more soon. I'm glad to get the extra copy of Semple's article, which I have. I drove him from the Archives to the NYTimes Wash office about that time. The DJ later also confirmed this to the Wash Post, which I quoted in the book because I had misleid thebTimes clip.

It was not before Clark's appointment but after. He was questioned as he left the Sen Jud Com hearing on his nomination.

When CIA WHITEWASH is published you'll see more on this. It is not ofteh that the integrity of a cabinet officer is vested in a lie. Note nothing has happened to the one who "misinformed" him.

Interesting Arthus wants to talk to me about his board. I'd never asked it. He had suggested, as you did, that I organize a foundation, which is not the same thing. He is going to establish an unofficial Kennedy archive. I'm all for that.

Several things in your attachment interest, esp. items 5 (source?). Wash Star hates Johnson, but not some of his policies.

I've almost finished PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH, very tired, and must rush it. This is part of the answer to your last question,

Sincerely,